

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

-17651

A man put out of work because his job has been made obsolete by a machine can turn to the federally financed program under the Manpower Development Training Act but he must have some native aptitude before he will be considered, according to the local DES.

Originally proposed for retraining those put out of work by technological change, it has become a way workers may get better jobs, according to one DES worker.

This training program does not appear adequate to meet the challenge of large unemployment. The courses last about 25 weeks and enrollments are selective. Since the program started last year, only 70 in this area have been trained. Another 39 are now in training.

## PRIVATE INDUSTRY TRAINING

Estimates vary as to how well private industry is doing in conducting its own on-the-job training. One industrialist said that machines are cheaper than men in the long run because of the increasing upward pricing of wages by labor unions.

An industrial officer commented that, although businessmen recognize the problem of the shrinking job market for the unskilled, they "cannot as businessmen act as welfare organizations" by taking up the task of training and retraining.

Informal training, worker to worker, is common, a spokesman of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the DES noted, but industry on the whole is "backward in retraining."

The same DES spokesman, noting that "automation is an unmeasurable thing," said, "We know there's a great deal of it going on."

## CUT DOWN CLERICAL TASKS

There are about 40 users of computers in this area now, according to Dana Hoyt, systems engineer manager of International Business Machines. Nearly all of them are working to cut down labor in record keeping and other clerical tasks.

The chief inroad of the computer in this area, he said, is not in cutting down present employment but in cutting the need for future workers, the familiar attrition system.

There is not much direct computer control of manufacturing here, he said, but the area is headed that way and is making progress.

"It is definitely coming," he said, "and the city should take cognizance of the trend and prepare for it."

(Next: The children of the poor.)

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, June 18, 1964]

## WAR AGAINST POVERTY: VI—PROGRAMS MUST HELP CHILDREN OF POOR

If the forthcoming war on poverty puts it accent on youth, it may be because the problem is so huge.

## THIRTY-YEAR WAR

Those who speak about ending poverty in the Nation talk about a long war whose real aim will be to break the circle of poverty for a generation, today's children. One economist, Robert Lampman, of the University of Wisconsin, has estimated it will take 30 years.

The circle of poverty, locking one generation of a family in poverty with the next, has been documented as a national problem. Both local and national studies have indicated that the children of the poor lack not only resources but the motivations to seek a better life and that they are likely to be tomorrow's poor.

An article last year in the Social Security Bulletin of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated, "There seems to be sufficient basis . . . for adopting as a working hypothesis that perhaps the single

medium most conducive to the growth of poverty and dependency is poverty itself."

## TREND OF GENERATIONS

The Springfield Union, in a series of articles last year, studied families in the welfare department's aid to dependent children program. The articles indicated that the same trend of poverty, afflicting one generation after another, exists in Springfield.

How many children of the poor are there in Springfield? There are few statistics available. Many of the children, it is expected, would be found among a large subgroup of the poor: the fatherless families.

In this city, according to the community renewal program which works with data from the 1960 census, there were 2,229 fatherless families. About 30 percent of them had incomes of less than \$3,000 a year, the threshold figure commonly adopted as the poverty line. The figures, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, include welfare payments.

The 30-percent figure is about double the percentage of Springfield families generally which had incomes of less than \$3,000, an indication that fatherless families constitute one of the principal poverty problems in the city.

## HOPE IN EDUCATION

Although local figures are lacking for the number of children among the poor, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has noted that nationally "one-third of the present poor are children. The greatest hope for eliminating poverty in the future is to improve the availability and quality of education for the poor children of today."

The same report states, "There is a growing need to provide facilities for the care of children of working mothers."

In a recent study on Negro problems, Dr. Hermon D. Bloch, an industrial and labor relations professor at the State University of New York, says that one reason for disintegration of a family without a male head is that the mother must work.

"Parental neglect combined with substandard incomes forces the youngsters to fend for themselves," he says, so that often the youngsters fall into delinquency and acquire a police record and their "social and economic chances are ruined."

Presumably a similar cycle works in this city and solutions to poverty proposed here will have to meet it.

(Next: The war on poverty.)

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, June 17, 1964]

## WAR AGAINST POVERTY: VII—PRESIDENT'S STRATEGY IS BROAD, VARIED, LEAVES ROOM FOR LOCAL INITIATIVE

The war on poverty as proposed by the Johnson administration promises to be a war on many fronts.

## ALLOWS FOR INITIATIVE

The \$962 million package includes broad proposals, like the heralded Job Corps, to attack poverty on a national level, and leaves room for local initiative in "community action programs," like the one being formed here now.

The administration program would set up a Federal center, the Office of Economic Opportunity, to supervise the poverty program, but promises widespread work through already existing Federal agencies.

It establishes a new Federal agency with all the propensity of such agencies for red-tape and at the same time promises to cut red-tape by setting up an information center where answers will be immediately available.

Here are some of the main national approaches proposed in the poverty program:

## THE JOB CORPS

It will tackle the program of hundreds of thousands of male youths between 16 and 21 who are out of school and out of work by

setting up conservation camps and training centers. Enrollment in either, both voluntary, will be for 2 years and members will receive a modest living allowance.

Both the camps and the training centers would aim at giving basic education and training for employment but the conservation camps would aim at more personal attention for those youths who have formed through privation, a hard shell of distrust.

The basic education aims are—what the youths are to be brought up to—are so modest they seem to indicate a failure of society and the educational system; an ability to read at seventh grade level; an ability to complete application forms clearly and legibly and to write simple letters; an ability to understand addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, and fractions; and an ability to be understood in conventional situations and to understand directions.

## THE WORK-TRAINING AND THE WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

In these, young men and women would be able to work part time in approved jobs so as to increase their chances of employment and attend school. The work-study program is intended for college students.

## FAMILY UNITY THROUGH JOBS

This program's purpose is to give vocational and literacy training to persons enrolled in the aid to families with dependent children welfare program.

## VOLUNTEERS FOR AMERICA

A domestic program patterned after the Peace Corps, the volunteers program would enlist persons for a year, including a month's training. The volunteers would receive a \$50 allowance and necessities would be provided. They would be assigned through Federal, State, and local agencies to work on poverty program jobs and for allied jobs being conducted by various Federal agencies.

## COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

The proposal is left with an open end. The communities themselves must come up with an appraisal of the scope of their problems and the plans to combat them, aiming always at the roots of poverty.

The Federal planning for this took into account many scattered activities in cities which could be fitted into the war on poverty. The community action program planning is to sharpen those which are good, cut out duplication and group them in a comprehensive, specifically aimed package for each city.

However, at the beginning of the poverty program, community projects are likely to be approved in a limited number of communities. One periodical put the probable number of communities at 75.

For this reason, Springfield city officials have tried to move quickly to draw up a program for submission to Washington. A draft program has been drawn up by a small committee and a meeting of a large group of department heads will be held soon to hammer out the city's proposal.

Included in the draft document are proposals to:

Put young persons to work in city and social agencies while they go to school. A canvass has rounded up offers of 200 positions.

Establish prekindergarten schools to allow mothers of fatherless families to work and to break attitudes of poverty early in children.

Establish health centers in poor neighborhoods.

Set up training courses for mothers on the rolls of the aid to families with dependent children welfare program.

It may be the community programs which would provide the most flexibility to the war on poverty with their ideas coming from many persons and being formed in many

17652

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 5

pilot projects. Because of this, the community programs may be more difficult to administer than the national programs like the Job Corps which apply a single remedy to one age group.

Other blanket solutions have been proposed; for instance, doubling social security payments to remove about 5 million elderly from the rolls of poverty. Recently, a guaranteed annual wage for low-income families also was suggested.

The amount of discussion about the poverty program is an indication of the enthusiasm it has generated in many quarters by those who feel the Nation now can eliminate a problem as old as history. Where the enthusiasm finally will lead if the multifaceted war on poverty is released by Congress is impossible to foretell. Some have seen through it a widening of the role of government in society far beyond the limits now thought acceptable.

The enthusiasm has been put into words by many persons, among them Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League. At a hearing of the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor on the poverty program, he spoke specifically about Negro youth, but his words might apply to the poor of all racial groups:

"This is what we in the Urban League and the other civil rights groups, churches and hopefully you, will be saying to Negro youth: that though you have faced barriers, discrimination, things that would have suggested that you are a nobody, that you are really somebody. And though there have been placed in front of you all of the handicaps, the obstacles, though you have been humiliated and though they would suggest that you are a second-class citizen, you are really a first-class human citizen.

"Stretch your minds and fly. This is what the poverty program is all about."

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, this Economic Opportunity Act will not by itself stop poverty in our country. It will not even, in my judgment, do enough to reduce our painfully persistent problem of hard core unemployment. But with 35 million persons—a group which represents fully one-fifth of America's families—existing in the "Other America" of deprivation, cutoff from the gates of opportunity, strong new efforts must be made and I rise in support of the bill.

Simple statistics deny a casual approach to this problem of poverty. For while more Americans than ever before are enjoying a higher and a rising standard of living, 11 million children, one-sixth of our youth, go to bed hungry at night. In 1.1 million families, women sit up at night trying to figure out how to feed their four children on \$5 a week. In 3.8 million homes, no breadwinner goes off to work in the morning. In 16 million households, children bring their homework home to a parent who has no more than an eighth grade education.

These Americans live on the outskirts of hope. For them it is a struggle merely to exist, and an unattainable dream to maintain a standard of living commensurate with human dignity.

And these people are not poor because they want to be poor, because they are stupid or because they are lazy. They are poor because, as author Michael Harrington points out in his excellent study on the problem of poverty:

They made the mistake of being born to the wrong parents, in the wrong section of the country, in the wrong industry, or in the wrong racial or ethnic group.

Most of these people, through no fault of their own, have had no hope of escape from their plight of poverty until now. Circumstances pulled them into the grinding circle, and circumstances have kept them there.

The tax cut, to be sure, has already begun to accelerate our rate of economic growth. By creating 2 to 3 million new jobs it has and will open exits from poverty at a faster pace.

But open exits mean little to those who cannot move—to the millions who are caught up in the clutches of poverty because of illiteracy, lack of skills, and racial discrimination. We must create new jobs but we must also equip the poor with the knowledge, the skills, and the health to fill them.

Mr. Chairman, the conquest of poverty is within our power. As the Council of Economic Advisers pointed out in their report this year, about \$11 billion a year would bring all poor families up to the \$3,000 income level we have taken to be the minimum for a decent life. This, the Council states, would not be an intolerable public burden since it would represent less than 2 percent of our gross national product.

But, as the Council has correctly emphasized, this is an unacceptable "solution" for it deals only with symptoms. The roots of poverty would remain untouched. The only solution acceptable to the American people—including the poor themselves—is one which enables each family to earn enough to raise its standard of living above the poverty level. It is one which enables everyone but the disabled to participate as full-fledged members of our modern economic society.

This bill accepts that challenge and places the initiative and responsibility where it properly belongs—upon local leadership to formulate long-range, comprehensive plans to eliminate poverty in each community. And I am pleased to report that in my community, the Seventh District of California, plans are already well underway to implement this legislation.

This bill offers a new hope, a new opportunity, a new life to those of our fellow citizens who up to now have not been able to share in the abundance of American society. It is a program which can open for the young, the opportunity to learn; for the able bodied, the opportunity to work; and for all, a better opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

This bill is a further attack on a major unmet need of our time and I urge its support and enactment.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11377) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

H.R. 12253

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, August 8, to file a report on the bill H.R. 12253.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may meet tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will say to the gentleman I shall not object because he and I discussed this matter earlier—in line with the suggestion made to the Speaker and the majority leader earlier today, if we are in a serious effort, and I hope we are, to adjourn sine die by August 22, we probably are getting to the point where legislative committees should wind up their business—they probably should have wound it up before now—except, of course, in a matter like this that is of great necessity and urgency.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I shall not object to this request, but I want at this time to indicate my conviction that if the legislative committees have not on the whole completed their business by this time, probably we should not be having meetings of those committees during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## THE SITUATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17653

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Last night I announced to the American people that the North Vietnamese regime had conducted further deliberate attacks against U.S. naval vessels operating in international waters, and that I had therefore directed air action against gunboats and supporting facilities used in these hostile operations. This air action has now been carried out with substantial damage to the boats and facilities. Two U.S. aircraft were lost in the action.

After consultation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress, I further announced a decision to ask the Congress for a resolution expressing the unity and determination of the United States in supporting freedom and in protecting peace in southeast Asia.

These latest actions of the North Vietnamese regime have given a new and grave turn to the already serious situation in southeast Asia. Our commitments in that area are well known to the Congress. They were first made in 1954 by President Eisenhower. They were further defined in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty approved by the Senate in February 1955.

This treaty with its accompanying protocol obligates the United States and other members to act in accordance with their constitutional processes to meet Communist aggression against any of the parties or protocol states.

Our policy in southeast Asia has been consistent and unchanged since 1954. I summarized it on June 2 in four simple propositions:

1. America keeps her word. Here as elsewhere, we must and shall honor our commitments.

2. The issue is the future of southeast Asia as a whole. A threat to any nation in that region is a threat to all, and a threat to us.

3. Our purpose is peace. We have no military, political or territorial ambitions in the area.

4. This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity. Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence.

The threat to the free nations of southeast Asia has long been clear. The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory. In Laos, the North Vietnamese regime has maintained military forces, used Laotian territory for infiltration into South Vietnam, and most recently carried out combat operations—all in direct violation of the Geneva agreements of 1962.

In recent months, the actions of the North Vietnamese regime have become steadily more threatening. In May, following new acts of Communist aggression in Laos, the United States under-

took reconnaissance flights over Laotian territory, at the request of the Government of Laos. These flights had the essential mission of determining the situation in territory where Communist forces were preventing inspection by the International Control Commission. When the Communists attacked these aircraft, I responded by furnishing escort fighters with instructions to fire when fired upon. Thus, these latest North Vietnamese attacks on our naval vessels are not the first direct attack on Armed Forces of the United States.

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress, on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

As I have repeatedly made clear, the United States intends no rashness, and seeks no wider war. We must make it clear to all that the United States is united in its determination to bring about the end of Communist subversion and aggression in the area. We seek the full and effective restoration of the international agreements signed in Geneva in 1954, with respect to South Vietnam, and again at Geneva in 1962, with respect to Laos.

I recommend a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO Treaty. At the same time, I assure the Congress that we shall continue readily to explore any avenues of political solution that will effectively guarantee the removal of Communist subversion and the preservation of the independence of the nations of the area.

The resolution could well be based upon similar resolutions enacted by the Congress in the past—to meet the threat to Formosa in 1955, to meet the threat to the Middle East in 1957, and to meet the threat in Cuba in 1962. It could state in the simplest terms the resolve and support of the Congress for action to deal appropriately with attacks against our Armed Forces and to defend freedom and preserve peace in southeast Asia in accordance with the obligations of the United States under the Southeast Asia Treaty. I urge the Congress to enact such a resolution promptly and thus to give convincing evidence to the aggressive Communist nations, and to the world as a whole, that our policy in southeast Asia will be carried forward—and that the peace and security of the area will be preserved.

The events of this week would in any event have made the passage of a congressional resolution essential. But there is an additional reason for doing so at a time when we are entering on 3 months of political campaigning. Hostile nations must understand that in such a period the United States will continue to protect its national interests, and that in these matters there is no division among us.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, August 5, 1964.

## MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time during the remainder of this week for the Speaker to recognize for a motion to suspend the rules and pass a joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say at the outset that you, Mr. Speaker, and the majority leader, have discussed this matter with me. I think it is a matter of urgency.

I think it might be well to clarify the request by suggesting that as we discussed earlier today it is expected that this resolution will be called up on Friday. If some unforeseen circumstance should make that impossible on Friday, then, of course, we would have to go ahead and call it up on Saturday. But may I inquire of the majority leader as to his intention and purpose in calling up this resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, that is our intention. It was understood in our discussions with the minority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We do expect and plan to call it up on Friday.

Mr. HALLECK. Further reserving the right to object, of course this is a resolution that was discussed by those of us who were at the White House with the President, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, and other people who were there. This resolution I believe to be in the national interest, following pretty much the pattern of resolutions adopted some time ago having to do with Formosa and the Middle East. As far as I am concerned, I expect to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## LET'S FACE UP TO THE TRUTH

(Mr. YOUNGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, Mr. Charles L. Gould, a member of the San Francisco Rotary Club, addressed that group on the subject "Let's Face Up to the Truth." Mr. Gould has a distinguished record in the newspaper world and has presented one of the most thought-provoking and inspiring addresses that has ever been my pleasure to read. It is extremely timely in view of the current events in Vietnam and I sincerely hope that every Member of Congress and every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take the time to read this most inspiring address, which follows:

17654

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 5

ADDRESS BY CHARLES L. GOULD BEFORE THE ROTARY CLUB, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JULY 21, 1964

Before moving into the main body of my address let me place myself on record on several points.

First, I do not presume to stand before you as an expert. I speak to you as a newspaperman and as a newspaper reader who has been watching world developments with care and concern for many years. I also speak to you as a Navy man who has been privileged to serve in many parts of the world in two wars. It is from knowledge gained in these areas of experiences that I compose my remarks today.

Second, I am not a saber rattler. I deplore war—but deplore slavery more. I believe the United States must strive to avoid fuzziness or foginess on international positions. Fuzziness can be misinterpreted as weakness. And weakness can encourage overt acts by those who seek to dominate the world.

Third, I am not a political or military extremist in any sense of the term. I subscribe to sound, solid, substantial policies at all levels of government. I am opposed to those who preach the "womb to the tomb" concept of socialized government—just as I am opposed to any concept that would wipe out all of the social agencies created in the past 30 years. I place the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, our Constitution, and the Bill of Rights as the best human navigational aids ever conceived by man. In the military sphere, I advocate every sensible and reasonable alternative to war—but, if we must engage the enemy in actual combat, I believe we must always fight to win.

Fourth, I do not see Reds under every bed. At the same time, I do not believe the Communist evil—external or internal—will disappear if we ignore it. We cannot afford to underestimate the cunning and cleverness of the high priests of this godless ideology and their dedicated disciples.

Fifth, I do not buy the philosophy that equates the right with the left. I deplore many things advocated and practiced by the so-called extreme rightists. However, I recognize these political rightists as a home-grown variety while the true leftists have roots in Moscow and are dedicated to the overthrow of our Government and the destruction of our liberties. The extreme rightists—as disturbing as they are—have no tanks or planes or guns. Since the end of World War II, there is no place in the world where they have acquired a single acre of land. In fact, rightist strong men like Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Batista, Peron, Trujillo, and Jimenez have had nothing but trouble since the end of World War II. However, the track record of the Communists during these years is clear for all to see.

Now, after establishing that frame of personal reference, let's look at the world. The cold war is nearly two decades old and the end is not yet. The bright bauble of real peace continues to elude us, and at this moment, in a dozen nations throughout the world, the United States is painted as the evil force on the international stage.

Our flag is desecrated in Panama; our sentries are spat upon in Berlin; we are insulted in Saigon, in Cyprus, in Zanzibar, in the Argentine, in Venezuela, in Pakistan, in Ghana, in Yemen.

Despots and dictators of the Castro, Nkrumah, Adoula, Sukarno, stature make wild and reckless charges and Uncle Sam becomes Uncle Sap to countless millions.

These widely separated incidents don't happen by accident. The sound and fury is the discordant music of an international orchestra. Back of most of the musical crescendos on the world stage you will find Communist leaders moving and manipulating pliable groups to their will.

Let's get down to specifics and talk about some incidents here in San Francisco. Take a look at some of the leaders of the city hall riots; look at those who were in the forefront of the Fair Play for Cuba demonstrations; study those who stormed the Presidio 2 months ago. Yes, compare them with those who were among the leaders in the palace sit-ins and at automobile row. In each group you will find a few familiar faces—the faces of a few individuals with Communist affiliations who seize upon every controversy to benefit their evil ends.

Now, let there be no misunderstanding of what I say.

Let me make it patently clear that the Communists are not—I repeat—are not responsible for the conditions that have resulted in the explosive civil rights movement here in San Francisco and across the width and breadth of our fair land.

We are responsible. You and I. We share guilt in being party to the national blindness, ignorance, apathy, and bitterness that placed a social blight on millions of our citizens.

None should minimize the injustice that has been done. None should underestimate the need for change and improvement.

At the same time, however, none should fail to realize that the most oppressed and depressed in our society today have greater freedom and greater privileges than do all the millions who are enslaved in Communist lands around the world.

Here, our Government fights to move minds long frozen with bias and prejudice.

Here, our Government fights to protect the rights of those who suffer under the burden of discrimination.

But what of other lands?

Turn the clock back to October of 1956. Listen with memory's ear to the roar of tanks and guns; listen to the shrieks of terror and pain as the tyrant forces of communism destroyed and devastated thousands of Hungarian patriots who sought only a portion of the freedom possessed by our most oppressed.

Let those in other lands who point the finger of shame at our Nation's social problems, pull back the curtains of truth and carefully and thoughtfully let them examine some of their own sordid practices and prejudices.

I do not mean to say that the evils of others make our evils less wrong. I do say that bigotry and bias are cancerous growths that exist in all lands and must be eradicated.

Legislation can point the way to social improvements. But only through education can these evils be truly eliminated. Education of those who cause the pain as well as education of those who have suffered too long.

In this last regard, we can point with some pride to the truth that the average Negro in our land has three times as many chances of obtaining a college education as does the average citizen—white or black—in England.

Let us, therefore, with eyes wide open—and hearts wide open, too—move with wisdom and alacrity to bring universal justice in our 50 States. Let us, at the same time, recognize as do most responsible Negroes, that the soil of civil disobedience is ideal for the sowing of Communist seeds.

Honorable groups gather to petition or parade and then, under the skillful manipulations of a handful of trained agitators, the groups become lawless mobs. And the legitimate and vital civil rights movement suffers as a foreign ideology profits by dissension in our land.

Now, there are those among us who find it hard to believe that a foreign power would use such wiles and treachery to undermine, divide, and weaken our Nation.

There are those who believe that Khrushchev is mellowing—that the threat of com-

munist is on the wane. They point to the fact that a few months ago Nikita gave the aging Harriman the symbolic bear hug and our Nation moved with dispatch to ratify the limited test ban treaty on nuclear devices. They say that more recently, Khrushchev released another dove of peace from the Kremlin as he quickly responded to our cutback in the manufacture of nuclear warheads.

But, let us ask ourselves: Is Khrushchev truly holding forth the olive branch? Is there truly a thaw in the cold war? Or is the Russian dictator merely zigging or zagging as a time-buying maneuver in his dedicated drive toward domination of the world?

Let us listen to Khrushchev himself. A few months ago in a conference with a group of Western diplomats, he said—and I quote—"You are rejoicing that we are arguing with the Chinese, but the more pleased you feel now, the worse you will feel later on." Not by word or deed have the Communist leaders changed their basic aims and objectives—to destroy our freedom.

But we are a peace-loving nation. We are eternal idealists. We let our hearts rule our heads. We let our hopes fault our vision. We close our eyes to truth and pray that the tyrants of the world will be converted to peace and brotherhood.

This faulty vision is not new with us. In the 1930's we closed our eyes to the invasion of Manchuria, the invasion of Ethiopia, the invasion of Poland, the invasion of Finland. We closed our eyes to these evils until the world exploded on our doorstep on December 7, 1941.

After World War II, we again closed our eyes to the sweep of terror as the Communist torch inflamed a dozen nations. Then—then on June 26, 1950, we again faced up to reality. As the Red hordes swept down from the north in distant Korea, President Truman called a halt.

Once more brave men from every State in the Union answered the call to colors and went forth to fight and die for freedom. Those who lived, however, learned the sad truth that their sacrifices—by some measures—had been in vain. For perhaps the first time in this Nation's history, we compromised on the battlefield and our military forces became political pawns on an international chess board.

Since 1953, when a peace pact was signed in Panmunjom, we have lived on a seething powder keg as the Communists have picked and probed and provoked on a dozen nerve centers of the world.

They tested our determination to resist aggression. And they found us wanting. They moved into Tibet and we took no action. They trampled Hungary and we took no action. They built the wall in Berlin and we took no action.

Yes, in truth, we are a people who fervently pray for peace. We are a people who hate war.

Bulies can push us around. We smile and turn the other cheek. But they can push us just so far—and no further.

And "far enough"—I believed—came on October 22, 1962, as the Russian warlords—convinced that we were weak and decadent—moved forward in a mighty buildup of military strength on our very doorstep.

A patient President was pushed to the limits of endurance. And a proud people heard him take the peace of the world in his hands as he quietly, with courage and conviction, told Khrushchev and his evil disciples: This far and no further.

I am sure that you and I shared the same emotions that momentous Monday evening as our late President delivered his historic ultimatum.

I am sure that you and I shared the same prayer—that our Nation would not retreat from its declared position; that our Nation would not again agree to a Korean-type compromise; that our Nation would embark upon